

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the above changes to the claims, and the following remarks, which are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed January 25, 2008.

I. Status of the Claims

In the Office Action, Claims 2, 5, 6, 11-16 and 22-27 were noted as pending in the application and were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10 and 17-21 were noted as withdrawn from consideration. As a result of this response, Claims 2, 5, 6, 11-16 and 22-27 remain pending, and Claims 12, 16, 22 and 23 have been amended in order to further clarify the claimed invention. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least in Applicant's application as filed on Page 9, lines 1-16.

II. Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, Claims 2, 5, 12-15, 22-24, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,834,299 to Hamilton, II et al. (*Hamilton*) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047460 to Kobayashi et al. (*Kobayashi*) in further view of the admitted prior art. (Office Action, page 2). Claims 6 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi* and Applicant's admitted prior art, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,478 to Anand et al. (*Anand*). (*Id.* at page 7). Finally, Claims 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi* and Applicant's admitted prior art, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,287 to Kumar et al. (*Kumar*). (*Id.* at page 8). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing rejections be withdrawn.

a. Independent Claims 12, 22 and 23

As noted above, independent Claims 12, 22 and 23 were each rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi* and further in view of Applicant's

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 05125.0001U1
APPLICATION NO. 09/944,288**

admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that neither *Hamilton* nor *Kobayashi*, nor Applicant's admitted prior art, whether considered alone or in combination, teaches, suggests or makes obvious each of the recitations of Applicant's independent Claims 12, 22 or 23.

In particular, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited teach or suggest "a control station computer configured for ... accessing a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier of each of a plurality of diskless host computers likely to be used in the system and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up a configuration corresponding to the received identifier, said configuration identifying the operating system associated with the diskless host computer," as recited in Applicant's independent Claim 12, as amended. Similarly, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited teach or suggest "accessing, by the control station computer, a database comprising a correspondence between a WWN of each of a plurality of diskless host computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up the configuration corresponding to the obtained WWN, said configuration identifying an operating system associated with the diskless host computer," as recited by Applicant's independent Claim 22, as amended. Finally, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the references cited teach or suggest "querying, by the control station computer, a database with the identifier received to determine an operating system associated with the diskless computer, wherein the database comprises a correspondence between an identifier of each of a plurality of diskless computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless computer, said configuration identifying an operating system," as recited by Applicant's independent Claim 23, as amended.

The Office Action appears to rely on *Hamilton* as teaching looking up a configuration corresponding to a received identifier or WWN. (Office Action, pages 2 and 4). Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that *Hamilton* does not in fact teach or suggest accessing a database comprising a correspondence between identifiers (e.g., WWNs) and configurations, wherein each configuration identifies an operating system, in order to look up the configuration

(and, therefore, operating system) associated with the diskless computer corresponding to a received identifier (e.g., WWN).

In particular, *Hamilton* is directed toward a “method and system … for the development and maintenance of a single configuration file for a storage area network combined with an ‘intelligent’ script which places server configuration files into the appropriate directories for servers which are part of the storage area network.” (*Hamilton*, Abstract). According to *Hamilton*,

automatic configuration of a server within each SAN … begins by opening a file containing information about all members of the SAN … The file containing information about all members of the SAN may contain one record for each server that is to receive configuration file(s). Each record in the file may contain two items: the server Internet Protocol (IP) address and *the server operating system*.

In this example, *opening the file may either be done by including the file name on the command line or by interacting with the user*. A determination is made as to whether or nor [sic] the configuration file name for the server is given on the file command line (step 500). If the configuration file name for the server is given on the file command line (step 500: YES), then the specified file is opened for processing (step 502). If no file name is given on the file command line (step 500: NO), then the user is prompted to enter a file name (step 504) and the name configuration file is opened (step 506). *A record for the server [which may contain the server operating system] is then received* (step 508).

(*Id.* at Col. 6, lines 20-43, *emphasis added*).

As described above, in order to receive the record identifying the server operating system, the system of *Hamilton* requires either that the configuration file name for the server be included in the command line, or that the user be prompted to enter the file name. Nowhere in *Hamilton* does it teach or suggest using an identifier (e.g., WWN) received in association with the server to access a database that stores a correspondence between a plurality of identifiers (associated with a corresponding plurality of servers) and a corresponding plurality of configurations, wherein each configuration identifies the operating system associated with the corresponding server. Instead, *Hamilton* teaches acquiring the operating system associated with the server through use of the configuration file name, either included in the command line or received from the user after being prompted.

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 05125.0001U1
APPLICATION NO. 09/944,288**

Accordingly, *Hamilton* does not teach or suggest “a control station computer configured for ... accessing a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier of each of a plurality of diskless host computers likely to be used in the system and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up a configuration corresponding to the received identifier, said configuration identifying the operating system associated with the diskless host computer,” as recited in Applicant’s independent Claim 12; “accessing, by the control station computer, a database comprising a correspondence between a WWN of each of a plurality of diskless host computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless host computer in order to look up the configuration corresponding to the obtained WWN, said configuration identifying an operating system associated with the diskless host computer,” as recited by Applicant’s independent Claim 22, as amended; or “querying, by the control station computer, a database with the identifier received to determine an operating system associated with the diskless computer, wherein the database comprises a correspondence between an identifier of each of a plurality of diskless computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless computer, said configuration identifying an operating system,” as recited by Applicant’s independent Claim 23, as amended.

Kobayashi and Applicant’s admitted prior art likewise fail to teach or suggest accessing or querying a database comprising a correspondence between an identifier (e.g., WWN) of each of a plurality of diskless computers and a configuration associated with the corresponding diskless computer in order to look up the configuration corresponding to a received identifier (e.g., WWN), wherein the configuration identifies the operating system associated with the corresponding diskless computer, as recited, albeit in somewhat different language, in each of Applicant’s independent Claims 12, 22 and 23. In fact, the Office Action cites *Kobayashi* and Applicant’s admitted prior art for different purposes. In particular, the Examiner cites *Kobayashi* as teaching “a switch ... and a control station computer monitoring for receipt of an identifier ...” (Office Action, page 3), as well as “receiving at a Fibre Channel switch a Word Wide Name (WWN) from the diskless host computer ...” (*Id.* at page 5). The Office Action cites Applicant’s admitted prior art as teaching “adding new devices to a SAN.” (*Id.* at pages 3 & 5). Since each of the cited references fails to teach or suggest the above-recitations of Applicant’s independent

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 05125.0001U1
APPLICATION NO. 09/944,288**

Claims 12, 22 and 23, the cited references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all of the recitations of independent Claims 12, 22 or 23.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 12, 23 and 23 are patentable over *Hamilton* in view of *Kobayashi* and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of independent Claims 12, 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

b. Dependent Claims 2, 5, 6, 11, 13-16 and 24-27

Claims 13-16; 2, 5, 6 and 11; and 24-27 depend, respectively, from independent Claims 12, 22 and 23 and include all of the recitations of their base claims and any intervening claims plus their additional recitations that further distinguish the art applied in the rejection. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claims 12, 22 and 23, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2, 5, 6, 11, 13-16 and 24-27 are further patentable over the references cited in the Office Action as such dependent claims now depend from allowable base claims.

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 05125.0001U1
APPLICATION NO. 09/944,288**

III. Conclusion

In light of the remarks above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP

/Jennifer F. Miller/
Jennifer F. Miller
Registration No. 56,278

Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Customer Number 23859
(678) 420-9300
(678) 420-9301 (fax)